

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended above. Claims 7, 8 and 11 are cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

**The rejection of claims 1, 4-8 and 10-11
under 35 U.S.C. §103 can be withdrawn.**

Applicant respectfully submits that even if the proposed combination of the *Sansevero* and *Vialonga* references were made, the result does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. There is nothing within those two references that discloses using a predetermined parking position as recited in claim 1. There is nothing regarding a pit access control signal that causes an elevator controller to automatically respond by moving an elevator car to a predetermined parking position and to stop the car once a sensor in the hoistway provides an indication that the car has reached that location. Applicant respectfully submits that the signals in the references allow an elevator mechanic to move a car to a position selected by the mechanic. That is not the same thing as a predetermined parking position. Given that the mechanic in the references can move an elevator car to any position the mechanic chooses, it would not be practical to have a sensor arranged like that recited in claim 1 to provide an indication to a controller that is automatically responding to the pit access control signal of Applicant's claim 1 in the manner recited in claim 1. Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection can be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the *Ach* reference does not disclose a predetermined parking position, either. As stated in column 2, lines 16-17, "The elevator car is parked at least one floor above the lowest floor." If anything, that suggests that a mechanic has freedom to choose any particular location within the hoistway that happens to be above the lowest floor.

There is nothing stating that there is a predetermined parking position in the *Ach* reference. Therefore, even if the *Ach* reference were added to the proposed combination of the *Sansevero* and the *Vialonga* references, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

**The rejection of claims 2-3 and 9 under
35 U.S.C. §103 can be withdrawn.**

Even if the teachings of the *Conchello* reference could be added to the proposed combination of the *Sansevero*, *Vialonga* and *Ach* references, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness for the reasons stated above. The rejection can be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

David J. Gaskey, Reg. No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: May 11 , 2010